



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/029,251

12/28/2001

Manolito E. Adan

003797.00207

6178

28319

7590

10/13/2006

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797
1001 G STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I'

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,251

Applicant(s)

ADAN ET AL.

Examiner

Abbas I. Abdulsalam

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 January 1935.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 32-35 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-29 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ 7/25/04, 7/26/04

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to a communication filed on 4/27/04 (interview summary). The finality of the previous office action is withdrawn, and the following non-final office action is issued. Claims 1-35 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 17-22, 24-26, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nishizawa et al. (USPN 6694306).

Regarding claim 17, Nishizawa teaches in a computer system including a host computer and first and second input/output devices, (Fig. 1 (101, 105), client 101 may be any type of computer, PCS or workstation, col. 5, lines 22-23; it is inherent that a data processing system (105) has input-output configurations) a method comprising: providing first information in a context at the first input/output device in response to a first user input; (client 101, Fig. (101)) forming a query associated with providing said context at the first input/output device;(application 102 from a client 101 issuing a query, col. 5, lines 33-34)and responsive to a

Art Unit: 2629

second user input, launching an application based on the query to provide second information in said context at a second input/output device (executes query processing through a remote database access unit (111), Fig. 1(105, 106, 111)).

Regarding claim 18, Nishizawa teaches the first and second input/output devices are remote peripheral devices (Fig. 1 (101, 111), remote data base access unit (111)).

Regarding claim 19, Nishizawa teaches the first input/output device is a remote peripheral device and the second input/output device is part of the host computer (see Fig. 1 (121) network 121 may be a local area network (LAN), LAN, local area network is known to be either proximity or remote connections).

Regarding claim 20, Nishizawa teaches the second information includes richer content than the first information (Fig.1 indicates a client including an application (102), whereas the remote database access unit (111) is functionally connected to local database access unit (116), query executer (110) and network 122).

Regarding claim 21, Nishizawa teaches the application is a browser (the network (121) may be the Internet, Fig. 1 (121, 106), col. 5, lines 20-22).

Regarding claim 22, Nishizawa teaches the application is a messaging application (the network (121) may be the Internet, Fig. 1 (121, 106), col. 5, lines 20-22).

Regarding claim 24, Nishizawa teaches the second user input is a single user input (see Fig. 1 (105, 111), it is inherent that a data processing system (105) has input-output configurations).

Regarding claim 25, Nishizawa teaches the first user input includes plural user inputs (see Fig. 1 (101, 103), multiple clients).

Regarding claim 26, Nishizawa teaches said forming the query includes translating the first user input into instructions understood by the host computer (see Fig. 13, where it shows query normal forms used in query translation, col. 5, lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 29, Nishizawa teaches computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 17 (portable storage medium, col. 14, lines 22-26)).

Regarding claim 31, Nishizawa teaches the query is a URL query string (query processing in terms of Universal Resource Locator, col. 2, lines 59-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 23 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishizawa et al. (USPN 6694306).

Regarding claim 27, Nishizawa does not specifically teach the first and second information are news information, the first information including a news story headline and the second information including the news story

Nishizawa on the other hand teaches query processing as a base for configuration of an information system capable of flexibly handling different types of data to be accessed, col. 3, lines 41-44, also see the abstract, access to multiple different real databases, Fig. 5 (117, 118)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Nishizawa's query processing with respect to multiple different databases for the purpose of receiving the desired query type (see the abstract).

Regarding claim 28, Nishizawa teaches the first and second information are news information, the first information including an abstract of a news story and the second information including a full version of the news story (query processing as a base for configuration of an information system capable of flexibly handling different types of data to be

Art Unit: 2629

accessed, col. 3, lines 41-44, also see the abstract, access to multiple different real databases, Fig. 5 (117, 118)).

Regarding claim 23, Nishizawa teaches the information includes subject and author of a message (query processing as a base for configuration of an information system capable of flexibly handling different types of data to be accessed, col. 3, lines 41-44).

6. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (USPN 6363398).

Regarding claim 1, Anderson (USPN 6363398) teaches in a computer system including a host computer, a main display unit and a remote peripheral device associated with an auxiliary display unit, the remote peripheral device communicating with the host computer, (see Fig. 1 (103, 109, 102), PC, 103 and monitor (102), server computer (109), it is inherent that the server also has its corresponding display screen) a method comprising: providing at the remote peripheral device notification of an event received from a source application at the host computer;(stock prices which are stored on a data storage device (10) on a server computer (109) are transferred through a network 113 to PC 103, col. 2, lines 12-14 and col. 2, lines 29-36) responsive to a first user input at the remote peripheral device, displaying on the auxiliary display unit information associated with the event; (see fig. 1 (101, 102), displaying a list of stocks & prices (101) on a display monitor (102)) forming a query based upon the first user input; (database query embedded within the URL, col. 3, lines 16-20) and responsive to a

Art Unit: 2629

second user input at the remote peripheral device, executing the query to cause the source application to be launched by the host computer (the server upon receiving a request for access to the active server page , executes a script stored within the active server page that receives the data base query embedded within the URL, col. 3, lines 23-28).

Anderson does not specifically teach a second user input.

Anderson on the other hand teaches the development of communications networks, personal computers in connection to and client-server network applications (col. 1, lines 17-20).

It would have been to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add additional computer to be connected to a server (109) because the connection of server to multiple computers is well known in a client -server system (col. 1, lines 17-20).

Regarding claim 2, Anderson teaches the event represents receipt of a message (see Fig. 1 (101) list of stock prices).

Regarding claim 3, Anderson teaches said executing includes displaying the message on the main display unit (it is inherent that the server (109) also has its corresponding display screen).

Regarding claim 4, Anderson does not specifically teach the event representing a receipt of calendar message.

Anderson on the other hand teaches the applet obtains the stock prices from a database management system 207 running on a server computer 208 (col. 4, lines 36-41, Fig. 2 (208)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to utilize the data management system (208) shown in Fig. 2 for the purpose of using the desired data since it is well known that events are represented by data system.

Regarding claim 5, Anderson teaches the notification comprises a visual signal (see Fig. 1 (101) list of stock prices).

Regarding claim 6, Anderson teaches the notification comprises an audio signal (It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to utilize the data management system (208) shown in Fig. 2 for the purpose of using the desired data since it is well known that events are represented by data system, col. 4, lines 36-41, Fig. 2 (208)).

Regarding claim 7, Anderson teaches the information includes subject and author of a message (It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to utilize the data management system (208) shown in Fig. 2 for the purpose of using the desired data since it is well known that events are represented by data system, col. 4, lines 36-41, Fig. 2 (208)).

Regarding claim 8, Anderson teaches the first user input includes plural user inputs (It would have been to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add

Art Unit: 2629

additional computer to be connected to a server (109) because the connection of server to multiple computers is well Known in a client -server system (col. 1, lines 17-20)).

Regarding Claim 9, Anderson teaches the second user input includes a single user input (It would have been to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add additional computer to be connected to a server (109) because the connection of server to multiple computers is well known in a client -server system (col. 1, lines 17-20)).

Regarding claim 10, Anderson teaches the application is a calendar application (the use of the Internet, web browser applications, col. 1, lines 36-49; it is well known to utilize a web browser application for a variety of purposes).

Regarding claim 11 Anderson teaches the application is an Internet browser (the use of the Internet, web browser applications, col. 1, lines 36-49).

Regarding claim 12, Anderson teaches the application is a messaging application (the use of the Internet, web browser applications, col. 1, lines 36-49; it is well known to utilize a web browser application for a variety of purposes).

Regarding claim 13, Anderson teaches the event is a news event and the information includes news information (it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to utilize the data management system (208) shown in Fig. 2 for the

Art Unit: 2629

purpose of using the desired data since it is well known that events are represented by data system).

Regarding claim 14, Anderson teaches said executing includes displaying the information on the main display unit (it is inherent that the server (109) also has its corresponding display screen).

Regarding claim 15, Anderson teaches computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 1 (data storage device Fig. 1 (107), col. 2, lines 1-14).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 16 and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Claims 32-35 are allowed

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abbas I. Abdulsalam whose telephone number is 571-272-7685. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

Art Unit: 2629

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abbas Abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2629

10/09/06



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600